

REMARKS

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner restricted claims 27-68 to one of the following groups. Specifically, the Examiner provided the following groups: (Group I) claims 27-46 drawing to a system for enhanced asset management; and (Group II) claims 47-68, drawn to a method for enhanced asset management.

After careful review of the Examiner's restriction requirement, the Applicant elects to prosecute claims 27-46 corresponding to Group I *with traverse*. More specifically, the Applicant objects to the Examiner's rejection on the ground of lack of two distinct inventions. For example, in the restriction requirement the Examiner classified both groups to class 705, subclass 28 and thus they are not two distinct inventions. In addition, the Applicant notes that the method of Claim 47 cannot be practiced without using the system of Claim 27; every element of Claim 27 as presented is recited within the method of Claim 47. Therefore, these independent claims are clearly related.

Furthermore, Applicant objects to the Examiner's rejection on the ground of lack of "serious burden" on the Examiner. As set forth in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, the criteria for restriction between patentably distinct inventions includes: (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct, and (2) there must be serious burden on the Examiner. See MPEP § 803.

Reply to Restriction Requirement of October 21, 2011

As discussed above, the inventions claimed in Claims 27 and 47 are NOT independent or distinct; they are in fact related (the method of Claim 47 necessarily practices the system of Claim 27). In addition, the Applicant stresses that:

If the search and examination of the entire application can be made *without serious burden*, the examiner *must* examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

MPEP § 803. For these reasons among others, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the restriction requirement and examiner all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is kindly asked to contact Applicants undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard A. DeCristofaro/
Richard A. DeCristofaro
Reg. No. 51,601

General Electric Company
Building K1, Room 3A61A
Niskayuna, New York 12309
Telephone: (518) 387-5832
1 November 2011